REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, a copy of the PTO-Form 1449 filed with the July 12, 2004 Information Disclosure Statement is provided for the Examiner's convenience. Applicants respectfully request acknowledgement of this IDS.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,866,393). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Yano fails to disclose a polarizing element maintaining a predetermined gap relative to the reflection-type liquid crystal display panel.

Claim 1 calls for, among other things, a light guide plate having a polarizing element stuck or adhered thereto on the side facing the reflection-type liquid crystal display panel and arranged maintaining a predetermined gap relative to the reflection-type liquid crystal display panel. Accordingly, there is a gap between the polarizing element and the reflection-type liquid crystal display panel.

In the rejection, the Office Action states Yano shows in FIGs. 1-2 a light pipe 1 corresponding to the light guide plate of the present invention, and a light source 2. A polarizer 24 is attached via an adhesive layer 12 to the light pipe. A liquid crystal display panel is not identified in the Office Action. Yano teaches a liquid crystal display panel 20 that includes the polarizer and a light diffusive layer 25. However, Yano does not have a polarizing element adhered on a side facing the reflection-type liquid crystal display panel, since only the adhesive layer separates the light pipe from the LCD panel. For at least this reason, Applicants traverse the rejection.

In addition, Yano discloses that an adhesive sheet is provided on the lower surface of the light pipe, and a normally white LCD panel is bonded to the light pipe through the bonding sheet on the visual recognition side. (See col. 11, lns. 11-16 of Yano). Yano further discloses that the adhesive layer prevents intervention of an air interface. (See col. 1, lns. 50-58). Accordingly, Yano fails to disclose a light guide plate having a polarizing element maintaining a predetermined gap relative to the reflection-type liquid crystal display panel, as recited in claim 1. For this additional reason, withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the reasons recited above with respect to the §102(e) rejection of claims 1-3.

Since claims 4-5 ultimately depend upon claim 1, they necessarily include all of the features of their associated independent claim plus other additional features. Thus, Applicants submit that the §103 rejection of claims 4-5 has also been overcome for the same reasons mentioned above to overcome the rejection of independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully requested that the §103 rejection of claims 4-5 also be withdrawn.

New claims 28-32 are added and further define the polarizing element as maintaining a predetermined air gap relative to the reflection-type liquid crystal display panel. Since the polarizer 24 of Yano does not have an air gap relative to the light diffusive layer 25, Applicants earnestly solicit allowance of new claims 28-32.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

Joseph P. Fox
Registration No. 41,760

May 24, 2006
300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978